

BW399

G 3

*The Leeds Organ Case:
Letter from a Minister,*

1827

*reference to
Bates
statement of facts &*

BW399
G3

Wesley Memorial Library

**Thursfield Smith Collection
of
Wesleyana**



Atlanta, - Georgia

Wes. 1551

LETTER II.

FROM A MINISTER, IN LEEDS,

TO HIS FRIEND IN THE COUNTRY.

SECOND EDITION.

SUBJECT.

*The Conference defended from the imputation cast upon it in
"a Statement of Facts."*

CONTENTS.

Opinions current in Leeds on the Organ-question, previous to the last Conference.—Views on this Subject, by the Rev. J. Wesley, Rev. R. Baxter, and the Rev. J. Benson.—Plan of pacification and Law of 1820, as bearing upon the present controversy in the Methodist Societies; with general remarks.

Leeds, November 2nd, 1827.

MY DEAR SIR,

OUR case at Leeds bears no small resemblance to that which occurred many hundred years ago in a famous city of the lesser Asia, Ephesus by name, during a great agitation of the public mind, attended with no small stir and tumult. We are told by the inspired penman who records the affair, that "that some cried "one thing, and some another," but "the more part," and perhaps the loudest vociferators in the whole multitude, knew not the cause of the disturbance. Said a poor, but shrewd and thinking member of our Society, the other day, "people tell me that things are

"very wrong and must be righted, but when I ask them what all this stir is about, there is not one of them can give me a satisfactory answer."

The good man's remark will suit, I believe, "the more part" amongst ourselves, and no wonder that you know so little about our situation in the country, when we are so ignorant in Leeds; but I suppose that there are some who have more definite ideas on the subject, and who understand that the cause of the agitation, now subsiding amongst us, has been the permission given by the Conference for the erection of an organ in the Brunswick Chapel. Indeed, we are gravely told in a printed document found in the "*Statement of Facts*," pp. 2—4, that "this is a measure which, whilst it destroys at once the excellent form of our venerable founder, is one which almost universal experience goes to prove to be subversive of spirituality in our congregational worship."

I was tempted almost to disbelieve the evidence of my own senses while I read the document containing these propositions, and noted that sixty names from amongst the "able and respectable body of Leeds Local Preachers" are appended to it. Justice to so worthy a body of men renders it proper for me to add, that many of them, it is believed, are *heartily sorry* for their inadvertence in affixing their names to a paper containing such unfounded assertions. Some of them, indeed, express their sentiments in print, and state the manner in which their signatures were obtained. It may be a point of some importance to note this, for a salutary warning to all who may hereafter be placed in similar circumstances. They tell us that they were "*induced to sign* by urgent solicitations, accompanied with the most pacific professions," and that "*in contempt of the earnest remonstrances of some of them*, the signatures they had given with peaceful views to a paper addressed to the Leaders' Meeting *only*, have been so published to the world as to involve them in a seeming connection with other proceedings and resolutions, against which they have constantly protested."

What * must any impartial person think of the spirit which could lead Mr. John Barr to publish this document in his "*State-*

* See the whole of the advertisement from which these extracts are made, in a Reply to the "*Statement*," &c. just published by the Rev. Isaac Keeling: to an attentive perusal of which, the writer of these letters earnestly invites those candid persons who feel interested in this controversy. If any coincidence of argument he observed between Mr. Keeling and himself, on subjects which it has fallen in the way of them both to notice, it may be important to be known that this circumstance has been the result of *entirely independent thinking*.

ment of Facts," not only without the privity, but against the consent of several of the parties whose names are affixed to it, nay, further, in despite of their earnest entreaties to the contrary! Said Mr. Barr, in reply to an application made to him on behalf of one of the Local Preachers, "*if he, (Mr. Henry Spink) would give me ten pounds, I would not desist from my purpose*," Was there ever a case in which a disposition to make mischief was more apparent? And Mr. Barr is the man who can pretend to feel "extreme indignation" at the conduct of the Conference!

We gladly leave the sixty Local Preachers of Leeds to the consolation which they may derive from the knowledge that theirs is not the first instance of worthy and intelligent men, good naturedly yielding to solicitations, the import of which they had not well considered, and signing their names in some unguarded moment, much to their subsequent but unavailing regret. But the propositions which they are represented as supporting, will require close inspection; for absurd as they are, they have been long received as unquestionable truths, and triumphantly appealed to as such, throughout all the length and breadth of Leeds and its vicinity. It is now high time that they were exhibited in their proper colours. The introduction of organs, then will "destroy the form of our venerable founder." What was his form? Will it be believed by our friends in Leeds, who are so zealous for the simplicity of Methodism, that it was the Form of Prayer used in the Church of England! It was the reading of those very prayers, the dread of the introduction of which amongst themselves, constitutes, I believe, after all, the principal grounds of their objection to the organ itself! And yet, between these two, viz., *the organ* and the *prayers*, there is no necessary connexion. In *City Road*, the prayers have for half a century subsisted without the organ: in *Keighley*, on the contrary, for the same period, the organ without the prayers. But, to return to our point, how explicit are Mr. Wesley's own words in preference of his *form*, i. e. the church prayers, to our own service. "Some say our own service is public worship—yes—in a sense, but not such as supersedes the church service; we never designed it should." Mr. Wesley's actions are well known to have been in conformity with his recorded sentiments. And there can be no hesitation amongst reflecting persons to admit, from the clear combined testimony of his words and actions, that had he lived a few years longer, and concurred, as he most probably would have done, in the generally extended plan of worship amongst us in the forenoon of the Lord's Day, the reading of the full prayers, or at least of his own abridgment, would have been universally established, and cheerfully acquiesced in by the whole body.

A second proposition contained in this petition from the Local Preachers to the Leaders' Meeting is equally remarkable with that which has been now considered: it is that "organs are found by almost universal experience to be subversive of spirituality in our congregational worship." I should be pleased to learn how the authors of that document have come by the facts on which they ground so sweeping a conclusion? I presume that they sent a deputation to Keighley, Bath, Newark, &c., the Societies of which have long been exposed to the pernicious influence of so evil an instrument upon the life and power of godliness, and have ascertained that a decline of those Societies in simplicity and spirituality, is connected with the unhappy date of its introduction among them. I suppose, also, that they are prepared to account for the circumstance that Mr. Wesley, jealous guardian as he unquestionably was of the simplicity of Methodism, should have permitted the introduction of organs in his day without any note of censure; and, further, that his own recorded opinion should be quite favourable to the employment of that instrument in religious worship. In his Journal for April, 1786, is this entry, Macclesfield, Sunday, 2nd, "We had a large and serious congregation at the church both morning and afternoon. The organ is one of the finest toned I ever heard, and the congregation, singing with it, makes sweet harmony."* Good Friday, March 29, 1782, "I came to Macclesfield just time enough to assist Mr. Simpson in the laborious service of the day: we administered the sacrament to about thirteen hundred persons. While we were administering, I heard a low, soft, solemn sound, just like that of an Æolian harp; it continued five or six minutes, and so affected many that they could not refrain from tears; it then gradually died away. Strange that no other organist that I know should think of this."† It is true he then adds, "In the evening I preached at our room: here was the harmony that art cannot imitate." But, by this expression, Mr Wesley certainly did not mean to insinuate that the use of an organ in his preaching room would have been inconsistent with that superior harmony. So far from this, I can state, on the most unquestionable authority, that, highly delighted as he was with the performance thus noticed in so marked a manner in his Journal,—on meeting afterwards with the organist, a gentleman but recently deceased, and well known to many in our connexion, he addressed him to this effect, "Mr. M'Lardie, if I could ensure a performance similar to yours this afternoon, *I would have an organ introduced into every one of our chapels.*"

* Works, Vol. VI. p. 51.

† Vol. V. p. 357.

It is matter, therefore, of great regret, that so many of the Leeds Local Preachers should have given the weight of their authority to propositions so completely untenable, in point both of principle and of fact, as those contained in the published document, from which we have extracted them. It would have been well indeed, if before adopting such a measure, they had consulted the venerable Richard Baxter, who would have given them wise counsel on this subject; he observes, as follows, "Nothing can be said against *Church Music* that I know of, but what is said against tunes and melody of voice. As some deride church music by scornful names, so others treat singing. It is a great wrong that [these] do to ignorant christians, by putting such whimsies and scruples into their heads as turn that to a scorn and snare and trouble, which might be a real help and comfort to them; as it is to others."* Great mischief, also, has resulted from this step, in the vantage ground it has afforded to designing men in their plausible attempts, "*by good words and fair speeches, to deceive the hearts of the simple.*"

There are, it will be readily acknowledged, individuals among us of justly merited reputation, who are opposed from principle, to the use of instrumental music in religious worship. "We might refer," say the Leaders' Meeting in their address to the Conference, "to the opinions of Dr. Clarke, Mr. D. Isaac, &c. &c., but we prefer a reference to the minutes of Conference." Very good;—sound Methodists will always prefer such a reference, and I am glad to be able to furnish them with one that has peculiar claims upon their respectful consideration. The firmly attached friends of Methodism, in Leeds and elsewhere, are not ignorant that it is in Mr. Benson's Commentary where, next to Mr. Wesley's standard works, they had to look for those views of our system in all its leading features, which have the cordial sanction of the Conference; and Mr. Wesley, himself, is known to have held Mr. Benson in no ordinary estimation; "perhaps," says he, in a letter to him found in the printed works, Vol. XVI. p. 495, "I can depend upon your judgment more than that of any other man." We have Mr. Benson's opinion on this controverted subject in his notes upon the one hundred and fiftieth Psalm. He quotes from Dr. Horne. "The people of God were (anciently) enjoined to use all the various kinds of instrumental music in the performance of divine services, and why should they not be used under the gospel. The custom was not introduced by the law, nor abolished with it. Well regulated music, if ever it had the power of calming the passions, if ever it enlivened and ex-

* Baxter's Works, New Ed. vol. v. page 501.

“altered the affections of men in the worship of God (purposes for which it was formerly employed) doubtless hath still the same power, and can still afford the same aids to devotion.”

Let it be kept in mind that this decided opinion on the affirmative of the question respecting the lawfulness of instrumental music, is found in a work which has the sanction of Conference, and which it strenuously recommends to all preachers and heads of families among us.* The Conference, therefore, assembling in Manchester the present year (1827) stood pledged by the theory it had adopted, and the practise now for several years grounded upon it, to lend a favourable ear to the application of the Trustees of the New Chapel in Leeds, and to gratify their wishes, unless very strong reasons to the contrary should be brought forward. Such strong opposing reasons are said to subsist in the present instance; let them be fairly stated and considered. They are found,

First, In the alledged opposition of the great majority of the Leeds Society, to the erection of an organ in the Brunswick Chapel;

Secondly, In that of the Leaders' Meeting presenting a barrier, under the Plan of pacification, to any further proceedings in the business: And,

Thirdly, In the refusal of their sanction, by the District Meeting, to the Trustees applying for it.

On the first of these reasons, the following remark is obvious: The circumstance of a majority of the Trustees of the Brunswick Chapel being in favour of an organ cannot be well accounted for; but on the supposition that very many members of Society, of the class for general information and respectability, to which the individuals composing that Trust belong, were of the same opinion with themselves; and, to the opinion of such persons, especially when viewed in connection with a regular attendance at the chapel in question, it must be allowed, great deference is due.

The second ground of objection to the introduction of an organ, is taken from the opposition of the Leaders' Meeting; the want of consent on its part being, as is supposed, a *constitutional impediment* under the Plan of pacification, to any further progress in the measure. On this subject we have some argumentation in the *Leaders' Address to the Conference*, found in the Statement of

* See Minutes for 1815—16.

Facts, pp. 11—12. "On reference to the large Minutes, Vol. I: "p. 322, we are told, that the Trustees, Stewards, and Leaders, "have the power of determining concerning the sacrament, ser- "vice in church hours, &c., and in page 326 we read as follows: "thus, brethren, have we done our utmost to satisfy every party, "and to unite the whole: you, by your Trustees on the one hand, "and your proper representatives, the Leaders, and Stewards, on "the other, are to determine concerning the introduction of the "sacraments." "Most assuredly, therefore, if words have any "meaning, the Leaders in our society are parties concerned in the "present dispute. It will avail nothing to say that organs are "not mentioned in the Plan of pacification: we would ask are or- "gans of greater importance than sacraments, &c. &c. and we must "candidly acknowledge that if our interference be rejected, and if "you determine that *Leaders* have nothing to do with it we "must necessarily consider such determination as a gross infringe- "ment of the Plan of pacification." Thus argue the Leeds Lead- ers' Meeting on a great constitutional question: they deserve, in re- ply, respectful notice. They seem to lay great stress upon the *meaning of words* in their reference to the Plan of pacification; but unfortunately for their argument viewed as looking this way, they have but one of the *material words* required, viz. *Leaders*, they want the other, viz. *organs*. How then the *meaning of words* can be brought in, or how there can be gross infringement of the Plan of pacification by any decision on a subject to which it never alludes, I profess myself utterly unable to divine! One thing I do seem to get hold of, and that is, their evident resting of the weight of their case upon assumptions and inferences. Let us see then how they succeed in this department. Their argument is of the com- parative kind, and, somewhat obscurely expressed by themselves, is to this effect; *sacraments* are of greater importance than *organs*, therefore if it is conceded that a Leaders' Meeting should have a right of determination respecting the *greater*, they ought also to have it respecting the *less*. It seems to follow from hence, that whenever governments make concessions to their people, the greater of the same kind is always to be considered as involving the less: but, would not this assumption involve consequences justly starting to the enlightened politician? The history of the settlement of our own constitution, at the revolution of 1688, ap- pears to furnish an appropriate illustration. The power of dis- pensing with established laws, was then formally taken from the crown. This is certainly, a greater power than that which it still retains, of confirming by assent laws which have passed the two houses; and it is a power in relation to the same subject, viz., legislation. But on the principle assumed by the Leaders' Meet- ing, the people of Great Britain have only to adopt the new fash- ion of reasoning, that meeting sanctions, and say "Is the confirm-

“ing of laws by assent of greater importance than dispensing with them? Assuredly not! The crown, therefore, having divested itself of the greater, cannot retain the less without gross infringement of the *act of Settlement*, and its accompanying “statutes.” Let it be observed that this illustration holds good on the principle manifestly assumed by the Leaders’ Meeting, that *greater concessions relating to subjects of the same kind always involve the less.*

But I am by no means prepared to admit that the *introduction of organs, and the acceptance of sacraments in conjunction with worship in church hours*, are subjects of the same kind. The *parties concerned* and the *matter of concession* are considerably varied. By the *Plan of pacification*, a power to accept of new times of worship and new ordinances is conceded,—by the Leaders’ assumption, a right to interfere in the regulation of worship is demanded, Two very different things certainly. The train of thought which I am here drawing out, in important conclusions on these controverted points, was suggested by the genuine good sense and sound reasoning inherent in a justly esteemed Local Preacher and Leader, of the Leeds East Circuit. When worship in church hours was introduced amongst us, this was contrary, *in terms* at least, to our rules as a Society; it was, therefore, right to appeal to the members who had been gathered together under those rules, whether they would assent to so material a change. The case of the sacrament, to which my worthy friend of *Barnbow* particularly referred, is, further, that of a spiritual ordinance exclusively designed for the members of our Society, and in which those who are mere hearers, have no concern. Here then, also, a power of accepting or refusing the provisions for their spiritual advantage allowed in the *Plan of pacification*, is of right vested exclusively in the members of the Society, expressing their sense through the medium of their Leaders, their proper representatives in this capacity. But the case of organs is on a footing essentially varying from this. The introduction of these instruments is a mere circumstance or accessory of worship, in which all the members of the Congregation have, *as such*, an equal interest. It follows that the Congregation, expressing its wishes through the Seat-holders to the Trustees, and by them, with the sanction of their approval, to the Conference, ought, in all fairness, to be favourably heard in such a matter. What valid objection can be raised against this? Here is a vast majority (some confidently say nine-tenths) of the Seat-holders, in connection with the majority of the Trustees of a Methodist chapel making a request to the Conference. What do they ask for? Are they desiring any change in the spiritual constitution or privileges of our Society? Are they asking for

the establishment of any new principle among us? They seek for nothing of the sort! The language of their application to the Conference is tantamount to this. "You have already given your sanction to the opinion of the lawfulness of instrumental music in Christian Worship; the Leeds Methodists have, without any manifestation of conscientious scruple, long employed one form of it, in aiding their devotions; we now ask your permission to employ another for the same end." If there can possibly exist a case, in which it would be proper for the Conference to manifest its deference for all descriptions of persons connected with the body, and its cordial disposition to meet the wishes of all, so far as might consist with higher interests, this assuredly is one! What the Conference has done in this affair has been on the great apostolic maxim—"please all men for their good unto edification."

But we now arrive at that part of the case, which Mr. Barr confidently puts forward as his *tower of strength*. "If," says he, "the advocates for the organ can satisfactorily answer the subsequent argument, I will at once give up the point." (page 31.)

Law of 1820.

"Organs may be allowed by special consent of the Conference; but every application for such consent shall be first made at the District Meeting, and if it obtain their sanction, that then it be referred to a Committee at the Conference, who shall report their opinion as to the propriety of acceding to the request; and also as to the restrictions with which the permission to erect an organ ought, in that particular place, to be accompanied."

Mr. Barr's argument upon the law, is summarily stated thus, "Where there is no sanction from the District Meeting there can be no legal application to the Conference, and if the application be illegal, the consent is unauthorized and a mere nullity."

The two latter clauses of this mighty argument may be easily disposed of: it is perfectly legal for any *bodies* or *individuals* whatsoever to make what application to the Conference they please: *the law* only points out the *sort of application* on this subject the Conference will be likely to attend to. Mr. Barr sets out wrong from the very first, in his reasoning on this subject; he follows his *game* so eagerly, that he *trips himself up* in the outset of his career. He contends that the Conference previously to the law of 1820, had *no power to grant an organ at all*. (page 33.) This is altogether false so far as it serves his line of argument.

The Conference *had power* at any of its annual sessions, first to repeal its prohibitory law of 1808, and then to grant an organ in any case it might think proper. The parliament has resolved that no one pound bank notes shall circulate on this side of the Tweed after a certain date next year,—but, even, though a positive standing order, forbidding any application for the repeal of its prohibition, should stand in the way, it would still be allowable for the bankers to apply for its repeal, and lawful for them to succeed, if the legislature so determined. How absurd it would be to say to the bankers “*your application was illegal, and the consent of parliament therefore unauthorized and a mere nullity.*”

What then is now left to be disposed of, is that part of the subject which concerns the *sanction of the District Meeting*; it is contended that the refusal of this sanction to any particular application, necessarily debars the Conference from any further consideration of it, for that year.

If this interpretation of the law of 1820 be the only correct one which a candid mind can possibly affix to it, the Conference has no mercy to expect from Mr. Barr and his friends, but stands branded before the whole world (Statement, p. 37) with “*a disingenuousness which will afford an ample triumph to the scoffer and the infidel,*” and “*with exercising an ecclesiastical tyranny of the worst and most alarming character.*”

The Conference certainly claims no more than its due, in requesting to be fairly heard, before such a view of its character and proceedings be generally admitted. If *such a sentence* is to be pronounced on the ground of mere reasonings and constructions put upon a statute contained in so few lines, it certainly is entitled to adduce in its favour, *other reasonings*; and, if they have equal adaptation to the case, to look for it, as matter of common fairness, that these should be adopted in the stead of those, by means of which Mr. Barr would fain deface it with such marks of indelible disgrace and infamy.

In coming to a right decision upon the point at issue, we must in the first place, conceive accurately of the precise situation which a District Meeting holds in the constitution of Wesleyan Methodism. On the death of Mr. Wesley, *District Meetings* were constituted, not as courts of final and irreversible decision in any case, in which such authority has not been expressly delegated to them, but as mere committees of the Conference itself, to expedite its business, and to prepare matters for ulterior discussion,

and final adjudication in that assembly. And this view of the constitution of these meetings is clearly signified in the name given at their institution "*The District Committee.*" In one instance, (the admission of preachers having completed their term of probation into full connexion,) it was for a time invested with final authority. But this right of *ultimate decision* being found in various ways inconvenient, as, indeed, it was quite incongruous with its proper character, was taken away in the year 1810, and thus a District Meeting was once more reduced to a conformity with its original design. What can be a stronger proof that a District Meeting is subordinate, in all things, to the Conference, and that it is the undoubted law of the connexion that all its proceedings are subject to the final decision of that body, than the *standing order*, that all representatives of Districts are required to bring with them or send, to Conference at a period some days antecedent to the actual meeting of that assembly, "*perfect copies of the District Minutes?*" Why *perfect copies*?—because all the proceedings to which those minutes refer, are subject to the supervision of the Conference, and liable to such modification as that assembly may think fit. Indeed I am warranted to affirm, that it did not enter into the contemplation of the Leeds District Meeting, in refusing their sanction to the prayer of the Trustees, to deny their right of appeal to the Conference! I am warranted to go further than this, and say, *they actually admitted it*, as they could not, indeed, do otherwise, and departed to their several circuits with the knowledge that such appeal would be made.

Such being the acknowledged position of District Meetings in the Methodist economy, let us now contemplate the Conference in 1820, legislating on the subject of *organs*. Resolving to open the way for an admission of these instruments, where such a permission might be deemed advantageous, they form the statute, the proper interpretation of which is now a mooted point. On the principle that matters of importance proposed to the Conference be previously considered in committees, they fix as a preliminary step, that all requests for organs shall be in the first place considered in a committee composed of the preachers of the District where the chapel is situate, the Trustees of which make the application. But did they intend hereby to make the consent or sanction of the regular District Meeting an absolute *sine qua non*, without which they would in no circumstances grant an organ. If this had been their design, they could have been at no loss to have put it in express words,—a proceeding which common sense would have dictated to them, if their intention was to give a new power to their District Committees. The statute in question would accord-

ingly have had a clause to this effect: "*But in no case shall an organ be granted, unless the consent of the District Meeting be previously obtained, on an application made to it at its ordinary place and time of assembly.*"

Mr. Barr (p. 31) resolves the law of 1820 into analytical propositions, I will follow his example, and have not the least objection that his analysis and mine be fairly weighed together, and compared with the law itself.

First, It will require *strong reasons indeed*, to induce the Conference even to hearken to an application for an organ which has not been made at a regular District Meeting.†

Secondly, Such an application, having the sanction of a District Meeting, comes forward under very propitious circumstances for being granted. And it is very likely, that having this previous sanction, and that of the subsequent Committee appointed under the rule, it will meet with ultimate success.

But Thirdly, The Conference, in the absence of express words to that effect, cannot be presumed from the terms of this law respecting organs, to have divested itself of its general power of supervision, and of the right which that power necessarily implies, to receive appeals from all persons, bodies, and courts whatsoever, known to the laws and usages of the Connexion,

Mr. Barr seems partial to analogies drawn from legal proceedings, and supposed to bear upon the present case. For my own part I am not disposed to lay much stress upon them, further than great principles are concerned: considered in this aspect, to my mind, their whole bearing is decidedly in favour of the proceedings of the Conference. Will Mr. Barr deny that the following maxim, given in substance, if not in form, is received in English law. It is this, *No inferences drawn from the wording of any particular statute, can be applied to set aside the express provisions of any other statute, or the common law of the realm.* If this be a maxim

† I had phrased this proposition differently, and written, "The Conference will in no case accede to an application for an organ, which has not been at first made to a District Meeting;" and this perhaps would be true in 999 cases out of 1000. There might however, (it struck my mind,) be a possible case, in which application had been attempted to be made at a District Meeting, and improperly stifled there in the commencement. Some circumstances which transpired this year at Manchester, and in which Conference, for the benefit of the people, thought fit to interfere under circumstances somewhat analogous to this proposition, suggested the alteration ultimately decided upon,

of law, as it is of self-evident reason, it follows that much less can such inferential constructions be held to alter the nature of any of the civil institutions of the country, or their relations one to another. The ready application to the matter in discussion is sufficiently obvious. There is, indeed, a similar relation subsisting between the Conference and its District Committees to that which obtains between the courts of Westminster and the commissions of assize sent down into the country. "These had their origin in the time of Henry II. and came in the place of the ancient *justices in eyre*, who were regularly established, A. D. 1176, 22nd Henry II. *with a delegated power from the King's own court.*" The great court was subsequently divided into the different courts now subsisting at Westminster, but the dependence of the *courts of assizes* upon the Westminster courts remains the same. This is evident from the power of revision exercised almost daily by the courts of Westminster over their committee courts in the country, and nothing is more common than that new trials should be granted, in order to consider, and if need be, to set aside the verdicts given in at the assizes, whether those verdicts, (I here again presume to differ from Mr. Barr) relate to matters of fact or of law, or both. The District Committee then and the Conference, being similarly circumstanced to these courts in point of relation, nothing was more natural than for the Trustees to give *notice of appeal* from the decision of the District Meeting; they acted upon this notice, and were sent back to a court, composed in a great degree of the same Judges, for a re-hearing of the case: on this the former decision was reversed, two persons only being in the minority. The anti-organist party being now, in its turn dissatisfied, move for a *second new trial*; this was solicited at a time when it was exceedingly inconvenient for the Conference to dispense with the attendance of so many of its leading members as were required for the purpose. Yet the new trial was cheerfully conceded to the wishes of the opposition; and all being fully heard, the prayer of the Trustees obtained the sanction of the second committee *without one dissentient voice*; it could hardly, therefore, fail of being finally ratified by the Conference.

Mr. Barr (p. 33) lays down a principle which will be readily acceded to. "When the language of an act of parliament is ambiguous, one of the most common and just rules of construction is so to construe the words as to give effect to the design which the legislature entertained when the act was framed. The reason of the law is to be consulted and in cases of doubt there can be no better guide." Let this principle be fairly applied to the matter now in course of argument. Why do the Conference require a primary application to the District Meeting? It is

on the principle of their presumed personal acquaintance with the local circumstances of the case. And the whole proceedings of the Conference, in this business, manifest a strictly faithful adherence to the spirit of their own law! Thus, on receiving an appeal from the Trustees, which they were bound to do by established usage, they *twice* refer the matter back again to the committee of the Leeds District, in conjunction with other preachers of character and long standing in their body, generally selected, it would seem on this principle of a personal acquaintance with the Leeds Circuits, in consequence of having been stationed there, or in the near vicinity. Mr. Joah Mallinson, I am given to understand, has the list containing their names, and can publish it if he pleases.

It is respectfully asked of the public at large, who may feel interested in this matter, that the train of reasoning now brought to a close be calmly and impartially weighed. It is assumed, and I do hope *proved too*, on the part of the Conference, that it has not violated the letter of its law, in giving its consent for the erection of this organ; and further that an undeviating attention to the reason of the law has marked its every step. I have been very explicit, and, perhaps, almost tautological, because the stress laid by Mr. Barr on this part of the subject seemed to require it. A condensed view of the *expediency* of the decision of the Conference, with a few concluding observations will close this protracted letter.

Before a fixed opinion is formed on this branch of the subject, the following remarks in connection with what has been already advanced, should be well weighed over in the mind.

First, The opposition to the organ, was, to a great extent, by parties not having any proper concern in the business. If the Leaders' Meeting, assembling at the old chapel, was, in the bulk of it, included in this opposition, it must be remembered that a large proportion of these leaders and of the members of their classes, made no part of the Congregation regularly assembling in the Brunswick Chapel.

Secondly, The introduction of the organ, was not opposed on any such conscientious principle as can be esteemed worthy of particular regard. The question, as a matter of conscience, is that of *instrumental music*. But this has long been admitted in all the Leeds Chapels,—nor could the Conference with any decency meet the wishes of the people assembling at the Old Chapel, or at other places of worship *in another Circuit*, by prohibiting to the

congregation of Brunswick Chapel one form of instrumental music, while those very objectors sanctioned another in their own long established practice.

Thirdly, The unconstitutional measures which have been adopted by the opposing party, even from the commencement of this affair, might have been easily discerned by themselves, had they taken time for reflection, to have been exceedingly likely to defeat their own object.—I refer particularly to the intromission of the body of local preachers into a matter, in which it was monstrous to suppose them to have any concern, in that capacity. Local preachers meetings are not in any sense governing bodies in the Methodist Connexion; their simple business is to regulate the matters of their own plan, under the direction of their superintendent; and they have no pretence to meddle with any thing beyond. In the present case, however, they have assumed that a right of interference in general questions is in some way or other secured to them by the Plan of pacification. This, strange as it may seem to persons only ordinarily conversant with our affairs, is clear from a document in the “Statement of Facts,” [page 17.] We are there informed, that, at a meeting, where fifty of them are said to have been present they resolved that the decision of the Conference respecting the organ, being “*in opposition to the opinion of the Local Preachers,*” is, *on this ground*, amongst others which they there specify, “a violation of the principles of the Plan of pacification, “and an infringement of their liberties, requiring a firm, but temperate, resistance to so arbitrary and unconstitutional an innovation,” (*Wonderfully temperate indeed, has that resistance been!*)

Let these extravagant claims be viewed in connection with the countenance given them by the leaders’ meeting, and with its own claims of a power entirely new to our constitution, the power of interfering *authoritatively* in the regulation of worship already established, which is a power quite distinct from that of chusing or refusing worship in church-hours, and the administration of the sacrament, under the provisions of the Plan of pacification:—Let all these circumstances be weighed together, not overlooking moreover the sort of *overawing influence*, which this state of things, even then advancing towards a baneful maturity, might probably have upon a district committee assembled in Leeds:—and I think you will be prepared to expect that the Conference should judge the present case one on which it was imperatively required to exercise its rights of supervision, and thus make it manifest for the general benefit of the Connexion, that such measures can hardly fail to defeat any cause, for the promotion of which they may have been inadvertently employed.

Fourthly, On the whole, it is evident that the Conference, desirous to act with a spirit of just regard to all orders and classes of our people, could by no means acquiesce in such an unauthorized interpretation of the Plan of pacification, by Leaders' or other meetings, as would go to debar itself from acceding to the wishes of trustees and even hearers, on any points consistent with the established principles of our doctrine and discipline. Let it not, however, be understood, that there is any disposition to deny to leaders' or quarterly meetings the right of making their opinions known, whether to the district meeting or to the Conference, according to the long established usages of the Methodist Connexion. Of the kindly and respectful disposition of the Conference towards these meetings, the reception which the deputies from Leeds met with in Manchester, affords convincing proof. Mr. Thomas Simpson, a highly respectable leader and local preacher in the Leeds East Circuit, bears ample testimony to the friendly attention shewn to those deputies by the Committee appointed to go into their case. Indeed, so strong was his impression on this subject, that, on the deputies taking their leave, he, as one of them, returned thanks for their kind and patient hearing. This is a circumstance not stated in the "*Statement of facts*," for it was not *a fact* of Mr. Barr's sort: but it is needful to notice it, since the narrative in his pamphlet is evidently so constructed as to produce a contrary impression.

Here then is the case of the Conference, on the *legality* and *expediency* of its proceedings throughout this affair. It may be proper to repeat that the right of receiving appeals from all subordinate courts in the connexion, has been in this case, acted upon on the proper and solid ground of respect to the wishes and liberties of all classes of persons among us. Deplorable, indeed, would be the situation of Methodists in general, in respect of a truly useful and practical liberty, if the Conference, divested of its paramount jurisdiction, could no longer receive appeals from all constituted bodies and private members in our connexion, on all subjects on which they might feel or fancy themselves aggrieved. Thus from the style of reasoning and invective in Mr. Barr's pamphlet, that salutary lesson may derive fresh confirmation, which the awful events of the last thirty years have tended to impress upon Europe at large, *that intemperate and ill-digested measures, adopted with a view to extend apparent liberty, may often be found to encroach upon its solid and valuable possession.* "A spirit of innovation," says Mr. Burke, "is generally the result of a selfish temper and confined views." No sort of talent, (if talent it may by any courtesy of speech be called) is of more ready acquirement than a volubility in railing against constituted autho-

city. In the very bosoms of the governed there is found the principle which views with complacency all such declamations; and which, in yielding assent unto them, gives them power still further to blind the understanding and corrupt the heart. "He that goeth about," says the judicious Hooker, "to persuade a multitude that they are not so well governed as they ought to be, shall never want attentive and favourable hearers; that which wanteth in the weight of his speech, is supplied by the *aptness* of men's minds to accept and believe it. [Ecclesiastical Polity. Book 1st.]

When you have perused Mr. Keeling's *Reply to the "Statement of facts &c."* which I gladly transmit you, and considered it in connection with the arguments on various points, which you may find in this Letter, I think you will agree with myself that, Mr. Barr's pamphlet makes, at least, as large a demand upon this "*aptness*" as has been called for by any of its predecessors, employed in the same easy but questionable vocation.

I am, dear Sir,

Your's respectfully,

THOMAS GALLAND.

P. S. The observations which may be thought necessary on the "*Vindication, &c.*" may be comprized in no very extensive compass. The principles on which the defence of the Conference rests, whether in Mr. Keeling's pamphlet or the letter to which this is a postscript, are left for the most part, without any attempt to unsettle them. In p. 21, "*Vindication*," the author re-affirms his former propositions and says that "he does not intend to trouble his readers with a repetition of the arguments already adduced in their support."—However, if he had designed his book to answer to its title of a "*Vindication*," it would have been well for him to have troubled his expected readers with some arguments in answer to those of his opponents. But his declining to do so is capable of being very well accounted for, when we find that Mr. Barr is evidently himself much more *troubled* with arguments than anxious to *trouble* others with them. *One fact*, he certainly establishes in his productions, and it is this,—that a command of the reasoning faculty is not his prime qualification for controversy; whenever he attempts some display of this sort, he naturally goes off into slanderous and abusive language. The expedient he employs in controversy is to denominate arguments

that would be troublesome if examined in detail, "irrelevant and "disengenuous."—Thus if you have patience to read his pamphlets through, you will find little else but a ceaseless ringing of changes on the words *popery, jesuitism, tyranny, &c.* brought forward in their various adjective and substantive forms, and placed here and there in sentences, where they might be thought most likely to act efficiently upon such minds as are capable of being influenced by them.

Mr. Barr's ideas, indeed, of a jesuitical argument are of so peculiar a kind, as to be quite a curiosity; in his latter pamphlet he kindly furnishes us with the means of ascertaining them. He refers to Letter 1st, (p. 5), where the dissentient local preachers and their friends are supposed to have discerned in himself "singular qualifications for the work assigned him, otherwise in "their choice of an advocate, their attention would doubtless have "been directed to men, who themselves had witnessed transactions "on which a Statement of Facts was to be grounded." The argument is this,—when the public are to be furnished with a "*Statement of Facts*" an eye or ear witness of such facts is generally selected to give it, if such, however, be passed by, and a person chosen to be the relator who himself must depend upon the testimony of others, *the chosen instrument* must be held so well qualified in other respects for his task, as to counterbalance this disadvantage. But of this representation Mr. Barr gives the following account, "I know not which most to reprobate, the "speciousness of this argument or its inherent jesuitical wickedness!" Is not this surprising! Where, you will be ready to say, does Mr. Barr draw his distinction between *jesuitical wickedness* and *common sense*? But those "who had witnessed the transactions" were members of Society, and are alledged to have been deterred from that course by the fear of expulsion; therefore there was a necessity that a person *not in Society*, should be the publisher. I will frankly tell Mr Barr that any member publishing pamphlets like his, would assuredly be arraigned *on charges of a moral nature*, and most probably excluded from our Society; but the same frankness will require me to add that no charge would lie against a member of our Society for publishing *facts* at once true in themselves and truly stated, in connection with *documents* which the publisher had fairly come by, and which he was allowed to publish by the consent of the individuals or meetings, to which they appertained.

It is somewhat laughable, and yet at the same time rather mortifying, to stand the assault of an antagonist, who is unconscious of the nature of your defence, and incapable, apparently, of even discerning the strength of your position. How does the

assailant in the present controversy, meet the leading lines of thought in the Letter to which these remarks are attached by way of postscript? It is affirmed for instance, that the principle of appeal from District Committees is a well known part of our constitution, and that the very District Meeting which rejected the preliminary application of the Trustees, allowed their right of appeal to the Conference;—how is this met in the “Vindication?” It suffices there to say, that this “pretended power of appeal, *“being not given by the law itself,”* had really no existence.” It would follow hence, that, in referring cases to previous inquiry in District Committees, the Conference needs to be perpetually reminding them that their decisions were not final, but subject to revision on appeal! How ridiculous!

It is shewn, again, in my letter (p. 13), that the conduct of the Conference on receiving the appeal, was regulated by the very principle which dictated the provision of its law, that principle being expressed in the very words of the “*Statement*,” and the proceedings of Conference put in juxta-position with them. Of course you will be anxious to discover what notice this gains in the “Vindication,” and will, I think, scarcely deem it sufficient when you find that nothing further is attempted than to call the reference of the appeal of the Trustees to the Leeds District Committee and others selected on the very principle of the law, “a clumsy artifice,” and the Committee itself “a pretended “District Meeting!”

Once more. The defence of the decision of the Conference, considered in the light of *an expedient* as well as *legal* measure is rested on the just desire of that body to shew respect to the wishes and liberties of all classes of persons, with whom it stands connected;—this ground of defence, you will observe, is altogether omitted to be noticed; and you will already have so much acquaintance with our author, as not to be surprised at this; since the only train of thought for the concoction of which his mind appears to be adequate, is violent abuse of constituted authority, expressed in *jingling changes* rung upon the terms *inquisition*, *jesuitism*, &c. and this is not easily capable of application to such a view of the subject.

I might remark upon our author's strange assertion that “Mr. Galland admits the Conference broke the law of 1820,” (a point blank falsehood certainly, when compared with my own express words p. 14, *supra*;) but I think you will be of opinion that enough has been said on the general question; and therefore I now proceed to those parts of Mr. Barr's “Vindication” which are peculiar to my own Letters.

On the subject of my *first Letter*, then I have to observe that being under the necessity of going out into the Circuit just on the eve of the publication of that Letter, it had neither my name appended to it, (which I had no wish to conceal,) nor a proper description prefixed of the subject of discussion. This should have been "Facts respecting Mr. John Barr, author of a late pamphlet intituled a '*Statement of Facts*' considered in several points of view, as bearing upon his qualifications to appear on the stage of this Controversy."

Let it be kept in mind by the readers of that Letter, that the person to whom it refers had assailed a body of Christian Ministers, in a most rude and unfeeling manner, and that the whole of his pamphlet evinces that spirit which the Lawyers would call *malice prepense*,—an evident design to ruin the characters of the members composing that body in public esteem, and thus to deprive them and their families of the means of subsistence. Let it be further borne in mind that, in my Letter, Mr. Barr is *strictly* considered in his relation to the Methodist Society, and that his conduct is hypothetically argued on several suppositions, (all indeed which the case admitted of) for the sole purpose of demonstrating the glaring impropriety of his presenting himself at all before the Methodist public in this affair.—Mr. Barr's observations on the first Letter certainly do not mend his case; they present on the contrary *topics of serious animadversion*, which he well deserves I should take up, but from which I shall almost totally abstain, at least for the present. According to his own acknowledgment (*Vindication*, p. 41) he *feels* under such an arraignment as my Letter contains,—*and he ought to feel!* I fear, however, that his feelings are not of that salutary kind which are described in 2 Cor. vii. 8. 11. To that passage I would solicit his particular attention.

We must now proceed to notice his attempts, such as they are, to do away the impression which my reference to the opinions of the Rev. Messrs. Wesley and Benson, can hardly fail ultimately to produce upon the minds of many, who under the impulse of a "*zeal not according to knowledge*," have heretofore so stoutly opposed the introduction of an organ into the Brunswick Chapel. "Mr. Wesley," says our author, "preferred the human voice to the finest organ he ever heard. Who doubts it? So, I will venture to say, does each and every one of the Trustees of the Brunswick Chapel! But "Mr. Wesley gave no encouragement to the use of organs in any part of the connexion." Why not? Mr. Barr wisely overlooks the reason with which he is furnished (2nd Letter, p. 5),—it is manifestly this, that Mr. Wesley, having an exquisite ear for music, feared, that in the case of his introducing

organs generally into his chapels, the resources of his Societies would not enable them to procure adequate performers.

But then on the subject of my quotation from Mr. Benson's Commentary, we have a special effort at reasoning,—an effort deemed by the individual whose transcendent powers were capable of it, so conclusive as to lead him to the triumphant appeal. (p. 48). “Here then is the ingenuousness of the man, in giving to the public what Mr. Benson did not say, and leaving out that which he *did say*.” Mr. Barr had previously engaged to furnish the readers with Mr. Benson's *own* words on the subject, which are” he says “as follow.” “The best music however, in God's ears, is that of devout and pious affections. [We must praise God with a strong faith, and with a holy love and delight; with entire confidence in Christ, and a believing triumph over the powers of darkness; with earnest desire towards him, and full satisfaction in him. We must praise him by a universal respect to all his commands, and a cheerful submission to all his dispensations; by rejoicing in his love, and solacing ourselves in his great goodness; by promoting the interest of the kingdom of his grace, and by maintaining a lively hope and expectation of the kingdom of his glory. M. H.] Without these, and such like devout and pious affections, the best and most perfect harmony and melody of musical sounds, whether from voices or instruments, is as insignificant before God, as the harsh and discordant noises of sounding brass or a tinkling symbol.”

In remarking upon this extraordinary effort of Mr. Barr, I almost feel as if I ought to ask pardon of my intelligent readers, for reminding them, that whatever a Commentator quotes from another writer without any note of censure, he evidently adopts as his own. In Mr. Benson's preface to his excellent Commentary, he divides his proposed labour into the business of composing original notes or observations, and that of selecting and abridging them from other approved Commentators, (Gen. Preface p. vii). To the whole mass of notes thus gathered together, Mr. Benson very properly prefixes his own name, and styles it, his Commentary. But how great a part of this admirable exposition of Scripture our author detaches from this designation, any person, who makes the experiment by opening the Commentary *ad libitum*, will soon discover. What Mr. Benson calls his Commentary, making, by his adoption of them, the words *his own*, I take as such; Mr. Barr's quarrel must be with that venerable person,—not with me. But to meet him on his own ground. Let our *well read* author take down Matthew Henry's Commentary from one of his shelves, and he will find that the most of Mr. Benson's *own* words, as he ignorantly terms them, are copied from the puritan divine! Nay

further, if a classical scholar, he will find that the remainder of his extract, is little more than a free rendering of a latin quotation, which is found in Mr. Henry's notes on the Psalm ! But, if it had been true that the whole of the *extract* he puts in opposition to mine had been Mr. Benson's *own* words, they were not likely to be quoted by me for this obvious reason, that they merely expressed sentiments, in which the advocates of organs participate equally with their opposers.

So much for our author's achievements in the line of argument ! I leave yourself therefore to judge, what "*everlasting honour*" redounds to himself and his *employers*, (and perhaps I should also include his *assistants*) from the *mighty work* of composing these two pamphlets.—For you will scarcely think it possible that such proofs of astonishing genius and towering talent, could be afforded by *one individual* (as are there exhibited,)—You will not, therefore, be surprised that some people in Leeds are of opinion that Mr. Barr, is not entitled to the *undivided honours* resulting from these wonderful compositions ; and they even go so far as to specify the potent auxiliaries who are entitled to *at least* an equal share of renown with himself. We are told indeed that these *partners of his fame*, are no less *practised tacticians* in the line which Mr. Barr has lately taken up, than are to be found in the family of the Editors of the Leeds Mercury,—And there are several reasons which incline me to a belief in the truth of this statement. It is an undeniable fact that by the present structure of Administration, the Leeds Mercury is thrown out of its usual track of comment upon public affairs, being no longer an *opposition*, but, strange to say, a *ministerial paper* ! The conductors of the Mercury are well assured that from those they are at present injuring, they have to apprehend no prosecutions for libel, nor heavy fines followed by two or three years imprisonment in *Ilchester Gaol* or *York Castle*. They may therefore readily suppose that their present proceedings constitute a mode of *drilling* the junior members of the concern in *opposition practice*, at once *pleasant* and *safe* ; being carried on at the trifling expense of the characters and feelings of those, for whom it would seem they care but little, because judged unable to make them feel in return, in those only ways, in which perhaps they are capable of feeling. Their conduct, however, in allowing a place in their weekly newspaper to certain garbled and mischievous statements of disputes in the Methodist Societies of Leeds,—in affording their pages as a medium for violating the *hallowed privacy* of assemblies of the elders of a christian church,—and in allowing to members of a religious community the advantages of its extensive circulation for contradicting their Pastor, and impeaching their Ministers in the most public manner,—their unjustifiable conduct, in all these particulars ;

is observed, I believe, by very many, and appreciated too, as it deserves. In vain have they been entreated to desist, and sound reasons exhibited why they should abstain from interfering in such affairs,—they have turned a deaf ear to all remonstrances; and adopted throughout the whole of these unhappy disputes, a line of conduct, at once the more unaccountable and censurable too, when it considered that the head of their establishment, Mr. Edw. Baines, has long been connected with one of the most respectable dissenting congregations in Leeds. It cannot therefore be doubted that he has been most ably and accurately instructed in the nature and obligations of christianity; he must have often heard that the “*carnal mind is enmity against God*,” and *the world* therefore, before whom he has, to say the least of it, *very inconsiderately* brought the present controversy; a most *improper*, because necessarily *prejudiced* judge in all such affairs. I would hope, that he may in future be disposed to *take advice* on such subjects, and consult those who will undoubtedly tell him, that to bring such matters before the public at large, in newspaper form and fashion, is throwing a stumbling block in the way of their own spiritual advantage, as well as highly detrimental to the general interests of religion.

I had drawn out an enumeration of *gross and glaring falsehoods* from Mr. Barr’s two pamphlets;—falsehoods respecting myself, one of which relating to my sunday school sermon at the Old Chapel, an individual with whom I have but a slight acquaintance, had the kindness for me, and the manly regard for truth, to tax Mr. Barr with it in his own shop; and if I am rightly informed, the *narrator of Facts*, being struck dumb, was fain to turn the conversation to some abstract subject;—*falsehoods* respecting proceedings at a distance from Leeds, some of them apparently coined in the well known mint, of that “*amiable and respectable individual*,” Mr. Mark Robinson, of Beverley;—*falsehoods* again, respecting the state of the *Methodist Book Room*, in the narration of which our author seems to be more than ordinarily *at home*. As might be expected, he atones for his wanton spoliation of the property of the preachers and invasion of their rights, (noticed Letter 1st p. 5) by aiming what are meant to be still more destructive blows at their property and that of the cause of God. But these efforts, if they lead to any inquiry on the part of our people into the affairs of the *Book Room*, will produce an effect, quite the contrary to what was designed. It is well known through the best informed circles in the Methodist Connexion, that the *Book concern* is deeply involved in debt, and that the profits which can be realized from it, must mainly be applied to meet its pressing obligations. It is matter, also, of equal notoriety, that the preachers’ profits on the books they dispose of, *are not Booksellers’ profits*, and that

they constitute no very adequate remuneration for the trouble and responsibility which are inseparable from their necessary engagement in these affairs.

But what need to proceed any further in such references, when it would be difficult to open either of the two pamphlets, without finding upon the page occurring, either some actual and palpable falsehood, some malignant distortion of truth amounting to the same,—or, if not these, yet almost inevitably, some attempt at reasoning, or exaggerated, declamation, founded upon some previous or subsequent falsehood !

It is without any affectation, that the present writer assures Mr. Barr. that the prevalent feeling of his mind towards him, is that of compassion. He would gladly do him good, and not evil,—and it is with this feeling, that *as matter of duty* he points out to him the severe denunciation “in a certain book of ancient date” against him who “*loveth and maketh a lie.*” In a very ancient part of that book also there are “*ten words*” the *ninth* of which Mr. Barr will do well to turn over in his mind before he constructs another pamphlet. “*May the Lord have mercy upon him, and incline his heart to keep that law.*”

APPENDIX.

It may be well to subjoin the *enacting statute* by which District Meetings were created. This will illustrate the *provisional character* of their institution, and strikingly exhibit their entire dependence upon the Conference.

Minutes for 1791.

“ Q. 8. What regulations are necessary for the preservation of our whole Economy, as the Rev. Mr. Wesley left it?”

“ A. Let the three kingdoms be divided into Districts; &c.”

“ Q. What directions are necessary concerning the management of the districts?”

“ A. The assistant of a Circuit shall have authority to summon the Preachers of his District who are in full connection, on any critical case, which according to the best of his judgment, merits such an interference. And the said Preachers, or as many of them as can attend, shall assemble at the place and time appointed by the Assistant aforesaid, and shall form a committee, for the purpose of determining concerning the business on which they are called. They shall choose a chairman for the occasion; and their decision shall be final till the meeting of the next Conference, when the chairman of the Committee shall lay the minutes of their proceedings before the Conference. Provided, nevertheless, that nothing shall be done by any Committee contrary to the resolutions of the Conference.”

General Minutes, [Vol. I. pp. 240, 241.]

In 1797, it seems to have been thought expedient to make some regulations with a view to render *Districts more effective*. Some Chairmen having complained of *want of power*, we find this provision to meet the case.

“ Regulation 3. That no Chairman may have cause to complain of the want of power, in cases, which (according to his judgment) cannot be settled in the ordinary District Meeting, he shall have authority to summon three of the nearest Superintendents, to be incorporated with the District Committee, who shall have equal authority to vote, and settle every thing till the Conference.”

[Vol. I. p. 379.]

Thus, even in this regulation for the increase of power in District Meetings, the great principle is cautiously preserved, that the acts of those Meetings, should be *merely provisional*. Enough has now been said on this point.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

LETTER 1st. Containing, *Facts respecting Mr. John Barr*, Author of a late Pamphlet intituled "A Statement of Facts, &c." considered in several points of view as bearing upon his qualifications to appear as an author on the stage of this Controversy.